3: Mirchuk S-4 (no date) 1949 RDl Ukraine RDl

lynskyj, Hrebinka etc.). Shevchenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet and Panko Kulish, the most eminent scholar of those days helped to perfect Ukrainian as a literary language. As all these writers came from Eastern Ukraine, the literary language grew from the East Ukrainian dialects of Poltava, Kharkiv and Kyiv.

In subsequent years Ukrainian became a still finer instrument in the hands of Marko Vovchok, Hlibiv, Konyskyj, Storoshenko and Shashkevych in Galicia and Fedjkovych in Bucovina.

After the Russian government laid a ban on Ukrainian (1876), literary and scientific life was concentrated in Lviv, the Ukrainian center in Austria-Hungary. This meant that western dialects came to their own, for many writers from Eastern Ukraine now published their works in the west (Myrnyj and Nechuj-Levytskyj, novelists; Starytskyj, dramatist and poet; Tobylevych, dramatist and later Hrinchenko, Kotsjubynskyj, Samijlenko and Lesja Ukrayinka, the greatest Ukrainian poetess). Ivan Franko is one of the greatest Ukrainians from the west at this time.

In Galicia a scientific and technical terminology developed so that in 1918 Ukrainian could take its place as the official language of the independent Ukrainian state and later of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. The following modern writers have done much to enhance the reputation of Ukrainian as a literary language: Olha Kobylanska, Bohdan Lepkyj, Vasyl Stefanyk (in a literary Pokutish-Volynian dialect), Oleksander Oles, Spyrydon Cherkasenko, Pavlo Tychyna, Maksym Rylskyj, Mykola Khvylovyj, Oleksa Slisarenko, Jurij Janovskyj, Jewhen Malaniuk, Bohdan Ihor Antonych etc.

The scientific study of the Ukrainian language was promoted above all by the Ukrainian Academy of Learning in Kyiv: Ukrainian has up till now been taught in lectures and tutorial courses in the universities of Berlin, Königsberg, Vienna, Münster, Halle, Prague, Naples and Paris. But Ukrainian philology was first studied in the 17th century (Grammar by M. Smotrytskyj in 1618). Two hundred years later A. Pavlovskyj's grammar, the first to deal with Ukrainian as a national language, appeared in Petersburg. And it is a Ukrainian, Oleksander Potebnya (1835—1891) who is the founder of Slavonic philology.

3: Mirchuk S-4 (no date) 1949 RDl Ukraine RDl

113
814

Several Ukrainian grammars have appeared in German, e. g. "Studien auf dem Gebiete der ruthenischen Sprache" (Studies in Ruthenian) by P. Ogonovski, Lemberg 1880. St. Smal-Stotskyj and Th. Gärtner wrote the "Grammatik der ruthenischen Sprache" (Ruthenian Grammar), Vienna 1913. Two books that served practical purposes were M. Simovych's "Grammatik zum Selbstunterricht" (Grammar for Home Students) and Jaroslav Rudnytskyj's "Lehrbuch der ukrainischen Sprache" (Course in Ukrainian), Leipzig 1940.

B. Hrinchenko compiled the most important dictionary: "Slovar ukraijinskoji movy", Kyiv 1907—1909. The Russian-Ukrainian dictionary published under the auspices of the Ukrainian Academy by A. Krymskyj and S. Jefremov is said to be the best of its kind: "Rosijsko-ukraijinskyj slovnyk" (to the letter P) Kyiv, 1924—1928. A large Ukrainian-German dictionary appeared in 1943. It was compiled by Z. Kuzelà and J. Rudnytskyj with the collaboration of Prof. Dr. K. H. Meyer and published by the Ukrainian Scientific Institute at Berlin. V. Kmitsykevych and V. Spilka published a German-Ukrainian dictionary (Czernovitz 1912); others were published by I. Sharovolskyj (Kyiv 1931) and H. Nakonetshna (Leipzig 1939).

874 of his fathers", of the Orthodoxy. He is thus a concrete symbol
795 of the synthesis of two worlds, of the harmonious and complete
union of two cultures, of the meeting of East and West and of
177 the fertilising of Ukrainian Orthodoxy by the Latin spirit of
.79 the Roman Catholic Church.

795 The seed scattered by Mohyla bore rich fruit. Hundreds of
874 scholars, writers, politicians and organisers graduated in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries from this unique "alma mater", the Kyiv Academy, equipped with the modern weapons of western learning, to fight first of all for the independence and the honor of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. After completing their studies in Kyiv the Ukrainian patriots of that time go to Germany to appropriate the arguments used by the Reformation against Catholicism, they penetrate to Rome and do not shrink from joining the Roman Church for a season only in order to become better acquainted with their opponent's plans in the very center of his camp. On their return home they develop an energetic campaign in teaching and writing to prepare and train wide circles of less well educated priests for the fight. In order to supply their audiences with intellectual munition, they publish a series of pamphlets directed against the enemy and all manner of apologies in defence of their own cause, utilising the knowledge they had gathered in the West. This leads to an enormous outburst of polemic writing, to an intellectual activity in the country which strikes even foreigners.

177 But the efforts of these champions of Ukrainian Orthodoxy
● 814 who had been trained in the West, did not stop there; they performed a still more important function in making European influence supreme in the state of Moscow, or the Russia of Peter, as it was then called. Ukraine contributed no mean share to the work of Peter the Great. The foundation and building of the modern Russian Empire was the almost unaided work of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, for the intellectual conditions for the solving of this task were almost completely lacking in Moscow itself. In order to carry out his reforms which soon degenerated into an absolute mania for reform, Peter utilised

the powers of the South which, in the 17th and 18th centuries could boast of a brilliant galaxy of scholars while Moscow and the North were still wrapped in darkness. The most important, but by no means all of the intellectual leaders in Ukraine were Herasym and Meletij Smotrytskyj, Christophor Philalet, Ivan Vyshenskyj, Kyrylo Tranquillion Stavrovetskyj, Zahar Kopystenskyj, Jelissej Pletenetskyj, Lavryn Sysanyj, Petro Mohyla, Kassian Sakovych, Taras Zemka, Sylvester Kossov, Lazar Baranovych, Joannykyj Galatovskyj, Dmytro Rostovskyj, Inokentyj Gisel, Stefan Javorskyj, Theophilakt Lopatynskyj, Teophan Prokopovych — and the list is by no means exhausted. The Moscow of these days had very few and not the most prominent names with which to confront this host. It is quite comprehensible that, in these circumstances, Peter I should have had too great a predilection for those products of culture, which had developed in Ukraine under the immediate influence of Western intellectual life. The contribution of Ukraine to the public life of Russia is perhaps best characterised by two men, Stefan Javorskyj and Theophan Prokopovych, both of them students and professors at the Kyiv Academy, the first of whom became "Administrator of the Patriarchal See" after Peter had decided to renounce the patriarchate, while the second was active as a reformer of church administration in Russia and as the Tsar's adviser in all important matters of state.

This process of the mutual penetration of the physical power of the North with the intellectual strength of the South, initiated by Peter the Great's reforms, did not bring lasting blessing to either. It was natural that Ukraine, politically crushed and intellectually exploited to the full by Moscow during the 19th century should have been obliged to lead the shadow of an existence; but neither was Moscow, the fortunate profiteer of this relationship, capable of maintaining the supremacy it owed to the artificial appropriation of European culture, for the products of western culture which had been transplanted from the south as the foundation of public life proved to be too weak to sustain the edifice of the gigantic empire in times of crisis. Even before the catastrophe, in the second half of the

3: Mirchuk S-4 (no date) 1949 RDl Ukraine RDl

Shevchenko's "Kateryna" by Mykola Arkas (1852—1909) and many others. 533

Mykola Lysenko (1842—1912), a musician who was successful in all branches of his art, and his successors created a revolution in music in Ukraine. After graduating from the Leipzig Conservatoire Lysenko returned to Ukraine. He took the folk-song as the basis of his compositions but, while it had hitherto been treated as something primitive, Lysenko seeks in it the essence of the musical ego of the Ukrainian people. He tries first to establish the scale of the Ukrainian folk-song and to develop from it a suitable harmony. He worked like a professor of ethnography and investigated the abundant material at his disposal according to scientific methods, no other nation possessing such a rich treasure of songs, both as regards quality and quantity. Without going into a detailed analysis of the Ukrainian folk-song, we may add that most of them are part songs, where each part is independent, and starts one after the other finally combining with the first voice, which results in an original counterpoint and rich harmonious melody. Lysenko was aware of the great wealth of Ukrainian folk-songs, but also of the great difficulty of studying it in its entirety. But the work had to be done as a guarantee of the further organic development of music in Ukraine. He did not consider it right to graft the music of Western Europe onto Ukrainian products, for he was perhaps the first to understand that Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Wagner and Brahms were first and foremost German composers who constructed their works on a scale derived from the German folk-song and that the roots of this folk-song lie deep in German musical consciousness. 814 533

The impulse given by Lysenko expressed itself first in vocal music; M. Leontovych (1877—1921) and K. Stetsenko (1882—1922) are products of the movement which he initiated. Their works are a synthesis of the impressive technique derived from the old vocal music of the 16th century on the one hand and of the Ukrainian folk-song on the other, from which they drew not only their motives but also their inspiration. This explains the enormous success of the Koshyts choir when it toured Europe from capital to capital, from Vienna to Berlin, Paris and London. 533

level of the earlier times. Western influences become more prominent; it is a time of transition, nor does the Reformation count for much, for even the Ukrainian translation of the Bible by Dr. Franz Skoryna in 1515 was a response to national needs and cannot be derived from external influences. The first Ukrainian books, on the other hand, were printed in 1491—93 by Shveipolt Fiol in a German printing-press in Cracow, and that in connection with the first Ukrainian academy (Ostroh 1577—1640), which had been formed for the purpose of publishing a critical edition of the Bible.

Literary and educative activity was really in the hands of the brotherhoods, which naturally were greatly interested in efforts to unite the churches. Polish literature worthy of note arose, important preliminary work was done in the province of language (Smotrytskyj's Grammar of Church Slavonic 1618), but it was only after Mohyla (1596—1647) re-organised the Academy in Kyiv that a cultural center was formed which was to play a decisive part in the literature of Ukraine for about 200 years.

Theological, rhetorical and philosophical works appear, the history text-book "Synopsis" by I. Gisel (died in 1684) goes through 30 editions, and Gregor Skovoroda (1722—1794), the most eminent philosopher of the 18th century in Eastern Europe and a student at the Kyiv Academy, wrote his books, the real significance of which is only being recognised now.

The cultural renaissance in Ukraine due to the brotherhoods and the Kyiv Academy brought new impetus to other provinces of intellectual life, as for instance dramatic art (Jakob Gavatovych 1598—1679, Mytrophan Dowhalevskyj 18th century. Demeter Rostovskyj, 1651—1705, the writing of history Samuel Velychko, died in 1728, Gregor Hrabyanka, died in 1737, and Gregor Poletyka, died in 1784), and also in plastic art which reached a high level of excellence in the Left Bank Region under Mazeppa's hetmanate. Young men in Ukraine were no longer content with native education; more and more they flocked to foreign, and above all, to German and Italian universities. Hetman Rozumovskyj's (1728—1803) intention to found a native uni-

3: Mirchuk S-4 (no date) 1949 RDl Ukraine RDl

Ukrainian decadence, wrote not uninteresting dramas, novels and short stories which, however, had no great influence on the public. The following are the most noteworthy members of the younger generation: Gregor Chuprynka (1879—1919), an impressionist who was shot by the bolshevists; Ol. Oles (1878—1943) worked at Prague as an emigrant; the short-story writer Arkhyp Teslenko (1882—1911) who died early after having been banished to the north by the Imperial Government; Petro Karmanskyj (1878), whose lyrics have a delicate, almost exotic tone; Bohdan Lepkyj (1872—1942), who has written historical novels. Olha Kobylanska (1865—1945) was a worthy representative of Bucovina.

Among the many representatives of the world of science we mention Borys Hrinchenko (1863—1910), the editor of a comprehensive dictionary of the Ukrainian language; Agantangel Krymskyj (1871), a famous orientalist, the organiser of the Ukrainian Academy in Kyiv and the supreme head of the newly created state of Ukraine, Michael Hrushevskyj (1886—1934), the most important Slavonic historian of the present day and author of a monumental book on the history of Ukraine.

The literature of Soviet Ukraine which is completely under the influence of bolshevism and Moscow has produced no talent of merit. Out of the great number of prose writers of novel and short story only a few original writers may be mentioned, such as Mykola Khvylovyj (1893—1933) who was driven by the cruelty of real life to commit suicide; Valeryan Pidmohylnyj (1901), Gregor Kosynka (1899—1935), whose end was tragic, too. Khvylovyj is noteworthy because of his desire to enrich Ukrainian culture with western influence and to keep it aloof from northern ideology; pressure from Moscow, however, forced him to abandon his theory. One great master of lyric poetry has appeared, namely Paul Tychyna (1891), though his gift of song has completely dried up in later years. Volodymyr Sosiura (1898) and Eugen Plushnyk (1898) are only worth mentioning for the variety of the rhythms they use; Valeryan Polishchuk (1897) is the founder of a new kind of meter, the so-called "vers libre". One of the most promising and gifted poets of today is Maksym Rylskyj (1895), a neoclassicist, who tried long

538 to uphold his artistic independence in the face of official pressure. But after many years of an unequal struggle his power of resistance broke down and to-day he writes in accordance with instructions from high places. The works of the dramatist Korniychuk, lately awarded the prize of the Union amounting to 100 000 roubles, are of no great artistic value, but only demonstrate a certain obvious tendency.

II.

814 Scientific work of any significance does not begin in Ukraine until the nineteenth century and is confined for the first decades to history and ethnography. This research, in so far as it was done in the Right Bank Region, received a certain support from the Russian government which, after quelling the Polish rebellion in 1831 wished to produce scientific proof that the areas right of the Dnipro have always been what the official language termed "Russian", and that Polish claims were therefore quite unjustified. Governmental circles in the Left Bank Region were not so interested in that question and so it was left to the private initiative of Ukrainian patriots either to preserve the ancient monuments of the glorious past themselves or to hand them over to the safe keeping of the Society for History and Philology at Kharkiv university.

The first proper attempt to organise Ukrainian research activity on a large scale is connected with the foundation of the "South-West Section of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society" in Kyiv, which united eminent Ukrainian scholars of the day for the purpose of working together. In a short time the society had acquired a high reputation in European scientific circles, which it owed as much to the results of its research as to its valuable publications. Then came the unhappy year 1876, when it was forbidden to speak or write Ukrainian and when the Kyiv Geographical Society was dissolved. Thus every possibility of scientific work was closed and scholars were forced by the pressure of altered circumstances to transfer their activity to one of the institutes affiliated to the universities and here, protected by the cloak of officialdom, continue working for Ukraine.

3: Mirchuk S-4 (no date) 1949 RDI Ukraine RDJ

Thus we find valuable contributions to the history of Ukraine in the collections of scientific works published by the "Society for History and Philology" at Kharkiv university, or in the reports of the "Nestor Society" which was founded at the Kyiv university by Prof. Volodymyr Antonovych (1834—1906). Every student of Ukraine finds a mine of information in the monthly publications of the "Kyiv Antiquities", founded in 1882; for full 25 years this review offered a means of publication to scholars like Mykola Kostomariv (1817—1885), Michael Drahomaniv, Oleksander Lazarevskyj (1834—1907), Orest Levytskyj (1849—1922), Oleksander Potebnia, Ivan Franko, Mykola Sumcov (1854—1924) and many others.

As a result of the great pressure on scientific life all over Russia, Ukrainian research in the Empire right down to the Revolution of 1905 could not develop freely on a national basis, the consequence of which was that the most important fields of this work, too, were transferred to Eastern Galicia. In 1873 the "Literary Shevchenko Society" in Lviv was founded with the help of contributions from Ukrainian patriots. After its re-organisation in 1893 into a purely scientific institution, it gradually became the real Ukrainian Academy of Learning. The reputation of the institution was greatly promoted by Michael Hrushevskyj, a Kyiv scholar, who was called to the Chair for Ukrainian History at Lviv university and appointed immediately president of the Society, in which capacity he developed a most beneficial activity. The best proof of this is to be found in the 300 volumes published by the Society from 1873—1914, containing essays in Ukrainian in all provinces of learning.

The revolutionary movement after the Russo-Japanese War which helped to introduce constitutional measures in Russia, brought certain relief to the Ukrainian people; this was first expressed by the foundation of the "Ukrainian Scientific Society" in Kyiv. This society was a center for scholars of all ages and, like its elder sister in Lviv, had a favorable influence on the young generation.

814 In the years before the First World War it published 24 volumes in which we also find articles by foreign scholars, mainly Russians, like Shakhmatov, Korsh, Perets, Ilinskij etc.

873 814 The World War had a paralysing effect on the cultural life of Ukraine as a whole. Hrushevskyj, its intellectual leader at that time, was arrested and exiled, all publication of scientific works stopped. But this depression did not last long, for the time was approaching when revolutionary movements in Russia were to lead to the establishment of Ukrainian independence. As a result of various technical difficulties, the universities in Kyiv, Kharkiv and Odessa, hitherto Russian, were left as they were except the foundation of new chairs for Ukrainian history, legal history, Ukrainian language and literature. In addition, two exclusively Ukrainian state universities were founded in Kyiv and Kamenets-Podilskyj as well as the faculty of history and philology in Poltava. Steps were also taken to organise the national archives, the Ukrainian National Gallery and finally the foundation of the Ukrainian Academy of Learning in Kyiv.

At first, the Soviet government did not interfere with the Academy of Learning, and even granted it a modest subsidy. Thanks to the devotion and the determination of Ukrainian scholars who did not leave the country, the Academy developed a lively and extensive activity in the years from 1925 till 1930, — though financial conditions were anything but satisfactory — and took a proper place among similar institutions in the world. But a radical change set in when the Academy, which up till then had been fairly independent, was forced into the service of communist theories; as a result nationally minded scholars were removed and bolshevist party ~~functionaries~~ introduced as members. The scientific level of the Academy sank enormously.

In the areas of Western Ukraine which were allocated to Poland, research activity decreased in comparison to pre-war years, which was mainly due to the lack of money.

As a result of the inflation of the Polish currency, the Shevchenko Society of Learning in Lviv lost much of its funds; it had to dispense with state help so that it could only continue a very restricted publishing activity. When Eastern Galicia was annexed

3: Mirchuk S-4 (no date) 1949 RD1 Ukraine RD1

by the USSR after the fall of the Polish state, the Shevchenko Society of Learning in Lviv was dissolved in December 1939. 873 814

The great hardships which the Ukrainian people has been exposed to in the last decades forced many intellectuals abroad where they attempted to found new centers of intellectual life. Thus the Ukrainian university in Prague, the college of Agriculture in Podjebrady, the Institute of Pedagogy, the Institute of Sociology, the Academy of Fine Art, the Society for History and Philology, the Society of Ukrainian Doctors and Engineers, the Ukrainian National Museum — all in Prague — came into being. The University, the oldest of the existant institutions, published a series of studies by its members, this being imitated with great zeal by other universities. We are justified in saying that, on the whole, Ukrainian emigrants in Prague were exceedingly active. The Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin also became an important center of Ukrainian scientific research abroad, its function being to develop its activity in close cooperation with European science. The publishing activity of the Ukrainian Institute in Varsaw, which published a series of valuable monographs, is worth mentioning.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Scholarly Revival

● 314 The third great field of development was in the realm of study and research, especially in such fields as concerned Ukraine, its history and culture. This was connected especially with the foundation and development of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and its subordinate institutions.

Ukrainian studies had developed during the nineteenth century and from the very beginning they had played a great part in the arousing of the national consciousness. While the scholars under the tsars were not allowed to touch the fundamental problems in the relation of Moscow and Ukraine and their results, of necessity, were compelled to stress the official line of the tsarist government as to the desire of the Ukrainian people to lose their identity in the Russian Empire, still studies in folklore and in folksongs could not fail to bring home the great differences in the mentality and aspirations of the two peoples. Ethnography could not fail to show that the customs and the manners, the architecture and the decorations differed in Ukraine from the Great Russian territory and the scholars, if they were sincere and careful, could not fail to notice it and to publicize it.

As soon as the Ukrainian National Republic was set up, the situation changed, for now there was a Ukrainian regime which was not afraid to speak out. There began, despite the hardships and the destruction of the civil war, a new flood of publications in all these fields. By 1918, under the regime of Hetman Skoropadsky, plans were made for the establishment of an Academy of Sciences, its statutes were drawn up, and a few members selected as a nucleus.

● 814 The changing fortunes of the war compelled the postponement of its realization but the work was not really lost. Soon after the definite formation of the Ukrainian Soviet government, the work was resumed, with those men who had survived leading in the work.

Despite some slight interference of the Soviet authorities, who demanded that history should be treated along the lines of Marxo-Leninism, the Academy succeeded in remaining almost completely autonomous. The period of the New Economic Policy, which seemed to restore the financial position of the country and the more peaceful life, provided a fairly favorable atmosphere. As a result the Academy flourished and in 1924, it was even able to invite Prof. Mykhaylo Hrushevsky, the recognized dean of Ukrainian historical studies, to return to Ukraine and take a position in the Academy.

Hrushevsky accepted the invitation and on his return to Kiev, he renewed the work of the old Ukrainian Scientific Society which had been united with the Academy. As head of the Historical Section, he fostered the creation of a large number of commissions in various branches of study and from 1924 to 1930 he edited a journal *Ukraine* which speedily became the outstanding journal in the field of historical and cultural studies. There was no period of Ukrainian history, no section of Ukrainian archaeology, art, and ethnography which was not assigned to some commission or group in the Academy.

At the same time the Academy was put in charge of most of the libraries, collections and resources of the older universities on Ukrainian territory. This had its good and its bad sides. It materially increased the resources of the Academy and the material at its disposal. On the bad side, it rendered more difficult the position of the younger scholars who were seeking to start upon a career.

814 The various Soviet Commissars of Education had made these
813 changes with the idea of securing large numbers of half-trained men and women who would occupy positions in the new state and take

the place of the old bureaucrats. They therefore turned the universities into technical schools of a rather inferior character, unlike the situation in Russia, where despite all the changes there was still preserved the fiction of university teaching and research. It was made clear that the teachers were not supposed to busy themselves with more advanced subjects for these were now the province of the Academy. Still there was a steady stream of young people into its influence and for several years it could well be said that there had never been a time when Ukrainian scholarship was so free and untrammeled.

The Academy in Kiev was, of course, the highest organ of scientific studies but it was not isolated, for some of the academicians, like Dmytro Bahaly, set up in Kharkiv a Chair of Scientific Research like an institute and Slabchenko did the same in Odesa. The example of these were followed in smaller cities and similar research centres were opened in Poltava, Chernihiv, Nizhin, Dnipropetrovsk, Kamyanets Podilsky, Vinnytsya, Zhytomir, Mykolayiv and Luhansk.

In the early years there was a constant effort to establish closer relations with the Shevchenko Scientific Society and the other scholarly institutions in Western Ukraine, and for some years there was an active interchange of views between the scholars of the two sections. Several outstanding Western Ukrainians were elected to membership in the Kiev Academy and the scholars went back and forth across the boundary with considerable freedom and cooperated in the development of Ukrainian studies.

In the field of history and of economics, it was necessary for the scholars to pay some slight attention to the Marxo-Leninist ideas. They could not too openly contradict them but it was usually possible, by the addition of a few official quotations, to speak quite plainly with regard for scientific truth and accuracy.

Even these restrictions were far laxer when it came to studies of language and material culture. The All-Ukrainian Archaeological Society and the Society for the Preservation of the Antiquities of Ukraine sent out expeditions to all parts of the country.

● 814 The studies for the enrichment of the language developed two opposing tendencies. There was one group, including Evhen Tymchenko and Olena Kurylo, which championed a puristic development. They rested their studies on the older forms and the peasant dialects and sought to remove from the language features which they felt had been erroneously added by the literary men and the colloquialisms of the day. The opposing school, including Ol. Synyavsky and many of the younger men, took the opposite attitude and welcomed the innovations which had been introduced into literature, especially from Western Europe. The discussions revealed the wealth and the variety of the literary resources of Ukrainian and, on the whole, broadened the appreciation of its independent character, even though in their use of terminology many of their words failed to come into common usage owing to the position of scientific Russian.

At the same time the scholars endeavored to coordinate the orthography of the language in the east and in the west, for previously there had been considerable variation in the Galician and Russian Ukrainian. Thus the eastern, following the Russian tradition, did not separate *g* and *h* and there were other differences, especially in the transliteration of European names into the Cyrillic.

To carry this work through there was held in 1927 a special conference in Kharkiv. Scholars were invited from all parts of the Ukrainian world, and after lengthy discussions there was worked out a standard system which represented the general consensus of scholarly opinion and opened a new period in the writing of the language.

At the same time there were published over thirty technical dictionaries and a group of academicians including A. Krymsky, V. Hantsov, K. Holoskevych, M. Hrinchenko and S. Yefremiv, began work on a great Ukrainian dictionary, six volumes of which, from A to P, were published. This was intended to be a general dictionary of the language and to represent all regions where Ukrainian was used, without stressing either archaism or reformation.

CHAPTER TWELVE

The Early Trials

517 186 The change of economic policy which had ushered in the collectivization of agriculture seemed at first to offer no threat to the cultural movement which was going on in Ukraine. Despite the open criticisms that had been made of Khvylovy and the more secret opposition that Skrypnyk was meeting, the cultural work continued in all its aspects. Politically the Commissariat of Education was still continuing its work, the new literature was proceeding with more and more important works being produced, and outside and somewhat apart from the political life of the day, Ukrainian scholarship was producing ever more serious works.

No one openly thought of overthrowing the regime although latent discontent could be discovered among the entire population. It had been years since there had been any open opposition. The unruly leaders who had appealed to arms had either gone abroad or quieted down and there was no one who was even suspected of the kind of disloyalty that had been widespread during the period of Militant Communism.

186 ●814 687 661 Then, in 1929, just as the compulsory collectivization was being prepared, the Ukrainian Soviet government announced that it had discovered the evidence of the existence of a secret society, the Society for the Liberation of Ukraine, and it commenced a series of arrests of some of the outstanding intellectual leaders of the scientific world. This resulted in a public trial and condemnation of the accused but for the most part they received relatively light sentences.

Who were involved? For the most part they were individuals who had played more or less important roles in the Ukrainian

186 814 687 661 [538] National Republic, who had gone abroad after its collapse and who had been invited back to take part in the work of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The government produced what seemed to be definite evidence against these people but the curious fact was that this evidence was strangely inconsistent with all of their previous activity. On the prisoner's bench were such men as Serhey Yefremiv, the leading scholar of Ukrainian literature and a relative conservative, the academiciam Mykhaylo Slabchenko, a former Social Democrat, Prof. Joseph Hermayze, a former member of the Executive Committee of the same party, and the well-known writer L. Starytska-Chernyakivska, who was close to Efremiv and who had more or less dropped out of the modern literary movement and was living in practical retirement.

The Soviet record of the trial strongly suggests that all those factions which, during the existence of the Ukrainian National Republic had utterly failed to come to any agreement, had somehow or other composed their differences in the days when Ukrainian sentiments seemed to be dominant in the ranks of the Communist Party and when there were outstanding Communists, like Khvylovy and Skrypnyk, pleading the Ukrainian cause. Yet, as was to be the case in almost all of the later trials, the court record based upon the testimony of the NKVD did not give any clue to the treasonable acts of which the defendants were accused and if they did, the stories passed belief. There was, likewise, no indication of the serious plans on which the organization was working or any details of its formal organization.

All the information that was revealed suggested that it was a definitely anti-Communist movement engineered by a group of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists who objected to the Communist program of Ukrainization. There was no hint that the accused had any connection with the derussification program of Skrypnyk or the demand of Khvylovy and his friends of the *Vaplite* for the development of a definite Ukrainian Communism. The Society for the Liberation of Ukraine appeared like a ghost from the past and the prosecution seemed to have the tacit support of even those elements which were working for Ukrainization.

Up to this moment the only open manifestation had been the demand of Skrypnyk that Communists be included in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences but this had apparently been answered satisfactorily and, with slight changes, the Academy was working as before. The most that could be said was that the leaders of Ukrainian thought in the Academy had not properly in their old age kept pace with the development of Marxo-Leninist thought but even this was hardly sufficient for the outburst which was loosed against a group of widely respected scholars.

Another curious aspect of the situation was that the most severe sentences were not given to the announced ringleaders and chief culprits but that there was unearthed on the occasion another society, the SUM, the Society of Ukrainian Youth, which consisted of relatively obscure students, village intelligentsia, peasants and workmen who were shot by the hundreds and thousands without being brought before any tribunal. The head of this group, Mykola Pavlushkiv, was involved in the trial but once again there was no indication that any members of the SUM had been engaged in any form of sabotage or anti-governmental work. Members of the organization who have escaped abroad have testified that the SUM was organized only on the basis of personal friendships and never undertook or planned any deliberate acts of sabotage.

The discovery of the Society for the Liberation of Ukraine with its assumed anti-Communist tinge was the signal for the opening of a campaign against the most respected older non-Communist members of the Academy. The usual method was by the device of demanding Communist self-criticism, and criticism. Its practice was brutally simple and effective.

The Communist organs, especially the GPU-NKVD, decided which of these scholars were to be broken ideologically (and morally) and which were to be removed without fanfare. The latter disappeared. The former group were forced to appear for public "self-criticism." This was preceded by a series of attacks in the newspapers as to the mistakes in Marxo-Leninism which the victim had committed.

186 814 687 661

Then, on an appointed day, a meeting was arranged in a large hall to which the public was invited by the display of large placards and other notices. Selected speakers attacked in the most scurrilous and abusive language various aspects of the work of the accused and ascribed to him the grossest errors. Then came the (obligatory) speeches of those who "wished to speak," i.e. his collaborators and students. These were carefully prepared by the Communist nucleus in the Academy or the Committee. The accused was then compelled to admit his mistakes and promise hereafter to work "in the spirit of Marxo-Leninism and the decrees of the Communist Party." These performances usually lasted for two or three sessions and then the critical "testing" of the work went on in special scientific meetings or scientific publications or in the torture chambers of the GPU. If the accused did not humiliate himself sufficiently or if the collaborators showed themselves insufficiently critical, "rotten liberal," "compromising," "opportunistic" or leaving "ideologically (or class) hostile loopholes," the process was repeated with still more bitterness against the main culprit and his collaborators or witnesses who had attempted to defend him were attacked with equal ferocity and their testimony was sent to the proper places for "consideration."

This was the treatment accorded to Prof. Hrushevsky who, in 1930, was criticized publicly and then arrested and deported to Moscow where he was prevented from doing any work and only after he was completely broken was he sent to a rest-house in the Caucasus to die in 1934. With his removal, the old historical studies almost came to an end. The Academy was reorganized as the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and nearly all the work in the humanities were stopped. The Historical-Philological Section was combined with the Social-Economic Section and nearly all of its special fields were abolished, while at the same time there disappeared a large number of valuable books and collections which were ready for publication.

This destruction of the older scholars in the Academy was justified by grouping Hrushevsky with his historical studies in the same

5: Manning S-4 (no date) 1953 RD1 Ukraine RD1

category of public enemies as Mazepa and Petlyura, and the three came to form a trinity subject to constant attack. Their leading crime was declared to be bourgeois nationalism, the object of which was to separate the Ukrainian from the Russian people and to deny the great significance of the teachings of Marx and Lenin.

In 1931 the Soviet authorities found traces of another organization, the Ukrainian National Centre. This is even more mysterious than was the preceding case, for it involved a number of apolitical figures who were living in retirement, as Holubovych, but at the same time it commenced the liquidation of the leaders of the former Borotbisty and Ukapisty. Still heavier sentences were imposed upon these men and large numbers were deported.

Then came an announcement of the extension to Soviet Ukrainian territory of the work of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists under Colonel Konovalets, and a number of more prominent Ukrainians were executed or deported for reasons that were never satisfactorily explained.

At the same time the Soviets seem to have spread rumors in connection with collectivization that there were movements for an uprising against the regime. They endeavored to have pseudo-Ukrainian patriots from Poland establish contacts with former officers of the Ukrainian National Republic who had dropped into obscurity and then, at a given signal, called for a revolt and easily overpowered their dupes.

Thus these trials eliminated from Ukrainian life the older scholars who had been trained before the period of Communist rule. They justified in the minds of the emigrés the correctness of their position in refusing to listen to the blandishments of the Ukrainian Soviet government during the apparently rosy years of the New Economic Policy, when it seemed as if there was to be a rapprochement with the West. How far the activity of these men, who had put themselves into the lion's mouth and perished, served to renew the Ukrainian courage and self-reliance has been much debated, especially in view of the fact that they were all destroyed as bourgeois, long before any serious danger seemed to

186 814 687 661 threaten the position of the various groups of Ukrainian Communists. Khvylovy, despite the attacks upon him and Skrypnyk, still continued to work for the greater Ukrainization of the population and of the cities and, so far, he had not been subjected to any too severe criticism. That was to come next.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

The Turning of the Cultural Tide

The Ukrainian Communists did not realize what they were doing when they launched their campaign against the bourgeois intellectuals and the aged scholars in the Academy of Sciences. For the first time since the period of Ukrainization had started, they had definitely called the attention of Moscow to the existence in Ukraine of a survival of the old independent mode of thinking which had animated the Ukrainian leaders in the struggle for an independent state of their own and they had coined a name for it, bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism. That was to recur again and again and lead to their own ruin.

It is remarkable that neither Skrypnyk nor Khvylovy realized this earlier. Both men in their own way were seriously threatening the unity of the Soviet Union, to which as an ideal they were loyal. Both men, Skrypnyk in the political field and Khvylovy in literature, realized the danger to Ukraine of substituting Russianism for Communism. Both men accepted in different senses the basic ideals of Communism and both believed in a Communist International which would offer all peoples full rights of cultural and political development. Neither one understood that the Comintern was a shadow structure which was totally dependent upon the forces operating in Moscow and that the situation in 1928 and 1929 was basically different from that ten years before.

In the RSFSR the charter of liberty for the fellow travellers which had been promulgated in 1925 was practically abolished by the granting of extreme power of control to Averbakh and the RAPP (the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers) which, to all intents and purposes, was issuing orders as to how the writers should support the Five Year Plan.

was to be administered in accordance with a plan drawn up in Moscow. He was replaced by Volodymyr Zatonsky, who had been one of the foremost advocates of russification.

The axe was used still more widely on the entire Communist Party in Ukraine. Within ten months, Postyshev removed two hundred thirty-seven secretaries of regional party committees, two hundred seventy-nine heads of regional executive committees, and one hundred and fifty-eight heads of regional control commissions. Nearly one thousand prominent Communists were removed, not to speak of lesser members. Since there were little more than 125,000 Communists in Ukraine, it is easy to see that a large proportion of the Party was unceremoniously eliminated. Elimination meant not only demotion but it was practically a death sentence, for those expelled were charged with that most serious crime against the state, bourgeois nationalism or sabotage, and the vast majority were either shot or deported.

Postyshev turned his attention to the Academy of Sciences which had already been purged of its leading members. Here he found some two hundred and fifty more who were removed on charges of Ukrainian chauvinism or sabotage. In their place, he introduced ordinary Communists or Russians with more regard to their reliability and their loyalty to Stalin than to their capability or scholarly qualifications.

Postyshev's object was the rerussification of the country, for it had already been commented in Moscow that there were too many of the young Ukrainians who were securing an education only in Ukrainian without knowing the master language of Russian. Skrypnyk had paid no attention to these complaints, for he retorted that in Moscow the young Russians were not learning Ukrainian and he assumed that all the Soviet Republics had the same rights. He was soon to learn differently, for from now on Russian was to be the official language of widest use.

In every considerable city Postyshev established Russian newspapers which had almost completely vanished during the period of Ukrainization. He opened Russian schools in the leading cities and he introduced Russian into all the other schools on an equality

old notion that "Mother Ukraine" had the same interest in all her sons, whether they were working men, peasants or intellectual nationalists. Both of them later revised their works under the kind leadership of the Party.

The proletarian writers and those who were content to write upon the prescribed or recommended themes were in their element. Kyrylenko and Mykytenko wrote glowingly and woodenly about collectivization and the elimination of the kulaks, "the dregs of society." Korniychuk, a young dramatist, presented in his plays all the appropriate Five Year plan subjects and gloried in the defeat of the old in the factories and on the collective farms. Everything in the literary field that glorified the Communist Party and rejected those ideas which had flourished under the preceding regime was applauded and the successful received honors and wealth and Stalin prizes for literary achievement.

The same development or retrogression was to be noted in the more purely scientific fields, especially where they touched studies dealing with the Ukrainian language, history or culture. Skrypnyk had removed some of the more distinguished members of the Academy of Science. Postyshev purged most of their followers and then he went on to reorganize the institution in the Communist way. The Academy was changed into a series of separate institutes, each of which was subject only to a carefully chosen Presidium.

Then, at the end of 1934 all of those institutes connected with the old Historical Section and which dealt with such subjects as Ukrainian archaeology, history, history of law, Western Ukraine, etc. were abolished. The study of the humanities was practically ended and the old staff was excluded. There were left only institutes of language and material culture to care for the past and all other subjects were handed over to the network of the VUAMLIN, the reorganized and strengthened network of Marxo-Leninist institutes, which could serve as a more reliable means of spreading Communist doctrine in a pseudo-scientific form. They created a new complex of societies as the Society of Marxist Historians, all of which had the avowed purpose of glorifying the regime at the expense of any form of scientific truth.

[1933 -- Analyst]

Ukraine Under the Soviets

626 814 191 In the field of studies in the Ukrainian language, under the leadership of A. Khvylya who had already distinguished himself by his attacks on the entire process of Ukrainization, new steps were taken to counteract all that had been gained by any school of thought.

In the beginning Naum Kaganovich had tried to show that the scholars of the preceding period had worked under the influence of "populist" theories of language. He was soon forced to change this to a statement that the work had been "bourgeois nationalist," the favorite slogan for anything that was not Russian. In his article, *The Language Theory of Ukrainian Bourgeois Nationalism,* he wrote: "Here under the conception of the people emerge the kurkul circles; the bourgeois nationalists have shaped the development of the Ukrainian language on the speech of the kurkuls." In another passage he declared: "By this approach to the people the bourgeois nationalists understand the removal from the language of everything that is connected with the October revolution, the removal of all features which bring it closer to the language of the Russian proletariat and the workers of the other republics of the USSR and the implanting of everything that is outmoded, conservative and permeated with the nationalist bourgeois spirit."

It was easy to see at what these new "scholars" were aiming. The old arguments as to whether the local dialects of the peasants or the newer, literary language which had been developed for over a century was the better Ukrainian were now replaced by the definite statement that the proper form was that which was the language of the more "advanced" classes, i.e. the Communists and their sympathizers, who were the least connected with any special area and were the least affected by any considerations of locality or traditional culture or usage. Even during Ukrainization the Communists of high rank coming from Moscow had been officially relieved of the task of learning Ukrainian. Now this was expanded and those who, of their own volition, learned a few words were adjudged the best authorities on Ukrainian because of their Communist knowledge and standing.

The new authorities set themselves the task of rooting out those

1 [1933 -- Analyst]

attempts which the "bourgeois nationalists" had made to bring together the Ukrainians of the east and of the west. They declared that the preceding group had sought to bring back capitalism and to separate Ukrainian from the "brotherly" Russian and to remodel it on Polish and German standards. They attacked any system of orthography and transliteration which differed from that used in Russian and in their attacks on Polonisms in Ukrainian they went so far as to call Polish any Ukrainian form which differed from the Russian, even when the Polish word in fact had the same form as the Russian and differed from the Ukrainian.

In the small dictionaries that were printed only those words were admitted that revealed Russian relations and the academician Krymsky once remarked of one of these that it was merely a Russian-Russian dictionary, so far had the process been carried.

In 1933 Khvylya published a new orthography for Ukrainian. This repudiated the work that had been done earlier to bring together Eastern and Western Ukrainian and sought to take as the standard those Ukrainian dialects that had been most thoroughly russianized, although at the same time he carefully avoided explaining the policy on which he was working.

Thus, during these years there developed a definite policy of disintegrating the language from within. It was based very definitely upon the old theories of the nineteenth century, that Ukrainian was merely a corrupt form of Russian and could not have any independent development, but such a statement which would have satisfied Nicholas I and Belinsky was not expressed clearly. It was enveloped in a mass of Communist jargon which appealed to the great names of Bolshevik ideology and covered a complete ignorance of any of the facts of language or of popular usage.

At the same time in another field Postyshev saw the opportunity to deliver further blows under the guise of progress and of satisfying Ukrainian aspirations. He moved the capital of the Ukrainian Republic back to Kiev from Kharkiv.[1] There were good reasons for this. The Soviet regime had been established at Kharkiv, because it was nearer to the Russian boundary and hence could more easily receive support from Russian military sources during the

[1] [1933 -- Analyst]

simply Russians was constantly increased. It was almost forbidden 626
to mention the name Ukrainian in connection with the older settlers 186
in Kuban, along the Don, in the Green Wedge along the Amur, etc. [191]
and it was a matter of perplexity as to what language they could be said to speak or what dialect in connection with later studies of the dialects of the Russian language. It was inadmissible to regard them as speaking a peasant dialect in view of the attitude of the authorities in recognizing some sort of Ukrainian, but it was even worse to believe that Ukrainian could exist in those regions and so they were simply passed over and forgotten, while the newcomers, usually being under some kind of a ban, were simply treated as Russian deportees.

Even this was not the whole story, for in such cities as Vinnytsya 661
during these same years the population was slaughtered by the thousands and buried secretly in carefully hidden burial places which were then turned into parks and playgrounds to conceal the extent of the crimes. This was repeated in many places but the situation in Vinnytsya attracted especial attention because during the War, the Germans found the places of burial and revealed the thousands of bodies of the victims, many of whom had been buried alive. The extent of these massacres was as great as was the killing of the Polish officers in Katyn, which was likewise brought to light during the war.

By the time the census of 1939 was taken and this was the last 162
one published, the growth of the number of Russians and the diminution of Ukrainians showed clearly that there was a large scale transfer of nationality which completely reversed the figures in some sections of Asia without regard for the natural laws of reproduction and mortality.

In this atmosphere the nature of the intellectual and literary 626
work in the UkSSR can well be imagined. The Ukrainian scholars 814 ●
were forced to accept the full Russian theories of the Ukrainian 661
past. This led to a complete revaluation of all the "outstanding figures." In 1933 the career of Bohdan Khmelnytsky was condemned on the ground that he was a typical representative of the noble classes. By the outbreak of World War II he became a Rus-

1 [1936-1938 -- Analyst]

626 814 661 sian patriot for signing the Treaty of Pereyaslav and bringing the Zaporozhian Kozaks under Muscovite domination. It was so in every branch of historical study. In back of the conception of the Soviet man and Soviet patriotism began to emerge with ever greater clarity the conception of Russian patriotism, as the doctrine of the "elder brother" who had given culture and civilization to the other nations of the Soviet Union became clearer and clearer.

626 814 191 It was the same thing in language. Khvylya and his friends had been working on a Ukrainian-Russian dictionary but this was immediately criticized by *Pravda* for its divisive tendencies, and the guilty compilers were liquidated. A new edition was started in 1938 on still a new principle. The Ukrainian and Russian words were to have the same number of synonyms and these were to have identical value. If, in any particular case, this did not prove to be true, it was so much the worse for the Ukrainian. If there were more words in Ukrainian to express various shades of one idea that there were in Russian, the words were banned. If there were fewer, the Russian words were supplied in order to show the influence that Russian had had upon the cultural development of Ukrainian.

The result was the reverse of what Zatonsky had proposed. He had suggested a mixed language with the idea that the Ukrainians would develop by practice toward the use of standard Russian. Now the new Commissariat of Education was introducing Russian into Ukrainian, forbidding the use of Ukrainian syntactical constructions which had no parallel in Russian in order to train the Ukrainians to speak Russian by infiltrating it into their native speech. The result would have been perhaps the same, but the important difference was that it preserved the supremacy of the Russian language in a pure form and corrupted the Ukrainian beyond recognition.

538 191 626 This procedure was too violent, even for many of the poets and writers who were most ardent in their support of the Stalinist regime. Men like Bazhan, who had put his pen entirely at the disposal of Moscow, continued to use some of the forbidden words and even obtained rewards for their obsequious phrases couched in

At the same time the nationalization of the land was commenced and this gave a good excuse for the elimination of another class of formerly prosperous people, whether they were Poles or Ukrainians. At first this was carried out along the lines of the Ukrainian land code of 1922, for the authorities were eager to get crops in when spring came. Still, during the summer of 1940 they began to urge the formation of collective farms. The peasants in some of the more backward regions listened to these ideas willingly, but in the better areas where agriculture was on a far higher and more efficient plane than in large sections of eastern Ukraine, they were very cool and meetings had to be postponed again and again if disorders were to be averted in the middle of the war. Still the Soviet authorities felt that they could waste some time until a real peace was restored and their hands were definitely free.

In regard to the educational establishments and all questions of organization, they acted without delay. In the first days of the occupation, the Soviet commissars seized the property of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and prevented all further work by confiscating the building and its contents and preventing all further publications. On January 14, 1940, they forced the complete self-liquidation of the Society. The president, Prof. Rakovsky, at once fled to the west and during the next uncertain months a large part of the active members made their way to Krakow in the Polish Government General, where they endeavored to resume their work. The Society was then turned into a branch of the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR and was placed under the control of the administration in Kiev, while part of its collections and its work was placed under the University of Lviv, which was now ostensibly Ukrainianized and given the name of Ivan Franko, the great Western Ukrainian scholar and writer. This was not for long, for very soon here, too, the lecturers to win Soviet approval began to switch over from Ukrainian to Russian.

All other societies of every kind were abolished and fitted into the Soviet scheme of things. The cooperative network, especially such great societies as the Maslosoyuz (Dairy Cooperative Society) and the People's Trade were made governmental organs. Various

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

Soviet Ukraine During World War II

In the preceding chapters we have briefly traced the efforts of the Ukrainians to profit by the clash between the two totalitarian powers of Germany and the USSR and the Ukrainian hopes of being recognized as an independent state. These hopes had been thwarted by the Nazi refusal to treat the Ukraine as anything except a field for German expansion and the Western refusal to recognize the Ukrainian struggle for independence.

This, of course, does not tell the entire story. From the earliest days of the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine, many of the leading Ukrainian patriots, writers, artists and scholars, including a large part of the staff of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, had seized the opportunity to retire to the west into the Polish Government General but there were many more who were picked up in the early deportations and deposited along with the Poles in Central Asia. Some of these, during the brief period of friendship between the Poles and the Soviets, were again able to make their way to the west along with General Anders and found themselves again at freedom, while those who had retired to the west were forced to undergo increasing persecution at the hands of the Nazis as these became more desperate.

On the other hand, when the break finally came in 1941 and the Ukrainians, including those mobilized in the Red Army, began to surrender in masses, the Soviets began to deport to the east all of the outstanding people on whom they could lay their hands and whom at the first moment they did not wish to exterminate. In this number there were such Ukrainian writers as Tychyna, Rylsky and others who had showed their loyalty to the regime by their tasteless flattery of the regime in Moscow.

722 In the same way, the authorities gathered up in frenzied haste machinery, finished products, and records and started them likewise to the east with the hope of setting them up somewhere in a safe place and using them to increase the Soviet war potential. All this was a hurried and confused process, for it was contradicted by the Soviet orders to reduce the Ukraine to a heap of ruins and to leave nothing available for the invaders.

[814] [661] The clash between these two ideas was vividly reflected in the destruction of Kiev. Some sections of the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR were hurriedly packed on trains and moved to Ufa. Other sections for little better reasons were abandoned in the general confusion or were mined for immediate destruction. Priceless books and records, no less than boilers and lathes, shared the two fates, while Kiev, thoroughly mined, was exploded and set on fire without regard for the needs of the people. The Soviet authorities, well aware that they could not evacuate the entire population, destroyed the food supplies of those who were left behind while other detachments massacred the helpless population indiscriminately.

The situation at Kharkiv and Odesa was far better and far more logical for the Soviets had a few days longer to sort out what they wished to remove and what they wanted to destroy, but even in these places there was the same wanton destruction which conflicted with the avowed aims of the Soviet authorities.

Then ensued a series of mutual recriminations, and it is still not clear in regard to many buildings and institutions whether the bulk of the damage and the losses were caused by Nazi or by Communist actions. Some 3500 carloads of machinery were shipped alone from the city of Zaporyzhzhya and most of this material was packed at night in utter darkness with no special care as to where it was being sent.

[466] The same situation confronted the workers, some 5,000,000 of whom were evacuated from the Ukraine and landed in rough factories that were hastily erected somewhere in Asia. These sometimes lacked even roofs and means of heating when the mercury dropped to 45° below zero.

Under such conditions, if the chaos and the disorder were not to be allowed to spread further, it was obvious that something had to be done to improve the morale of the population. This was particularly evident and necessary during the early months when it seemed as if the Nazis might decide to make some concessions to the people. As a result, there were a series of developments undertaken which superficially, at least, offered some concessions to the spirit of the various non-Russian nationalities. 722

Thus, in 1943 the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR was allowed to celebrate its twenty fifth anniversary at Ufa in the Bashkir Autonomous Republic and to list its institutes which were scattered throughout Asia. Such an event rendered it possible to blame the Nazis for the destruction of what had not been evacuated. It furnished good propaganda for the Western powers who were already sending copious supplies to the USSR and receiving in return from it only condemnation and criticism. [814]

In the same way, the various writers who had passed the approval of the government were assigned posts as newspaper correspondents in the Red Army where they could sing the praises of Stalin. Yet, at the same time, they were encouraged to write articles and poems which would reflect the hostility to the Nazis and again and again the censorship was relaxed for men like Sosyura to write poems in praise of the Ukraine, of its past, its present and its future. 722 538 626

Others like Yanovsky and Bazhan were allowed to emphasize the separation between the traditional Ukrainian speech and the jargon that had been put out in the various Ukrainian-Russian dictionaries after the breaking of the Ukrainian Renaissance. They were allowed to assemble collaborators to compile a more conservative dictionary and to revamp the system of orthography which had been the work of such pronounced Russian sympathizers as Khvylya during the preceding period. [198] [814]

Yet, these concessions were more apparent than real, for under the wartime conditions, those Ukrainian scholars that had the apparent confidence of the government were scattered far and wide. They were living perforce under abnormal conditions and 722 814

722 814 no efforts were made to bring them together or to conduct a revival of the Ukrainian work that had been so ruthlessly and needlessly shattered. It was a wartime device adopted for a passing situation and the masters in the Kremlin well understood that the fury of the war had done more than they had ever dreamed possible for the disintegration of the various Soviet Republics. Once, therefore, the evacuation had taken place, the Soviet leaders had only to sit by and to reap the profits. There would be plenty of time for that later and so the war years seemed an intermission in the relentless pressure that had been exerted in the past.

648 661 [167] It was for the Soviet leaders a far more vital problem to recover the masses of the people who had fled to the west or had been carried away by the Germans and who might, even in case of a victory of the democratic powers, reveal the full force of the Soviet pressure. That was why they welcomed the Yalta Agreement which provided for the compulsory return to the USSR of all refugees and deported persons and why, once peace was restored, they showed such devilish ingenuity in trying to recover the control of every one who could testify from personal experience as to the nature of the Soviet rule.

It was with the greatest surprise and lack of comprehension that the Western leaders became aware of this situation. They had listened eagerly to the Soviet siren songs that it was only Nazi sympathizers and criminals and traitors who did not want to return under the Soviet rule and it required some months before supposedly serious statesmen recovered their equilibrium sufficiently to understand the way in which they had been duped in the middle of the war.

Yet, no sooner had Soviet rule been reestablished than the old processes were revived with even greater energy and vigor. The last masks of independence or of free thought in the cultural or economic fields were torn away and the old persecution and charges were pressed with every increasing zeal.

000 in an ideal organization. Stalin, by his policy in the thirties, blew away that mirage but it required a World War for him to annihilate it.

Soon after the Germans attacked, Stalin dissolved the Comintern to please his Western allies and to dupe them. He substituted the Slav Congress and when he secured the assent of the Big Three to liberate the Slavs, he highly developed this.

186 728 As the Red Army, now transformed by fiat of the Council of Commissars of the USSR into the Ukrainian and Byelorussian armies, "liberated" one Slav capital after another, they were followed by cultural missions who talked to the enthusiastic multitudes on the Slav Brotherhood of Nations in terms of 1848, Peter, the Third Rome and Stalin. Rylsky and Tychyna, Korniychuk and Yanovsky, all the outstanding Ukrainian writers who had yielded to the Russian cause and survived the purges, spoke. They praised the new situation and the democratic powers admired this.

665 It was only a sham because soon there was established the Cominform. Its seat was not in Moscow but its spirit was there. The object of the Cominform was not to create a new and equal gathering of Communist humanity, not the ostensible idea of the Comintern but it was to inform the Communists among the Slavs and elsewhere of the approach to Communism by the elder Communists of the world, the Muscovite Great Russians.

[538] In the purely cultural sphere the answer was the condemnation of formalism, and still more of internationalism. Formalism was a technical school of literary criticism which had contributed something to the study of literature and culture. It was an attempt to put technique above content, or rather to judge content by technique and its advocates, sometimes great scholars in a narrow field, basked in the light of the admiration of their friends, until they considered themselves great.

●814 665 Internationalism was something else. Its content had been expressed by the Protopope Avvakum in 1666 when he announced at his trial in Moscow that all Orthodox Christians had to come to Moscow to learn. Now it was the same. History was to be periodicized between A. M. and P. M. (Ante Muscoviae and Post

Muscoviam, Before and After Moscow). If the before was leading up to a Moscow discovery, it was good; if not, it was bad.

This was proclaimed by Zhdanov of the Politbiuro in 1946 when, under the highest auspices, he began his attack. On September 4 of that year, at a meeting of the Umiom of Soviet Writers in Moscow, he lashed out at various films which had been recently produced and at several Russian authors, especially Zoshchenko and Anna Akhmatova, for not producing a true picture of Soviet reality. Then, warming to his task, he explicitly declared that literature had to be entirely at the service of the Communist Party and that it was the duty of every Soviet writer to lash and scourge the decadent bourgeois west. He berated many of the authors for wishing to learn from the bourgeois writers at the very moment when Soviet literature, the most revolutionary literature in the world, was a hundred times higher and more beautiful than the literature of the bourgeois west.

The speech of Zhdanov was the open proclamation of war against all foreign influences in Soviet literature and it was directed against some of the most respected figures, who were apparently silenced. Even Tikhonov was removed from his post at the head of the Union of Soviet Writers for not having exerted himself more strongly against these dangerous heresies.

Yet this speech was not really the beginning, for some weeks before the question was fully brought into the open, at a meeting of the KP/b/U, Khrushchov, the Russian who held the post as First Secretary of the KP/b/U, had received from the Executive Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow full and definite instructions as to the means to be adopted for purging Ukrainian literature and science and for suppressing all traces of bourgeois nationalism. His remarks were reprinted in part by *Pravda* in Moscow, which summarized them in these words.

"The TsK KP/b/U had not paid sufficient attention to ideological work, does not give enough weight to the selecting and the ideological and political education of the cadres in the fields of science, literature and art, has not organized in the press a wide criticism of the hostile bourgeois-nationalist ideology. As a result

538 626 665 in some books, journals and newspaper articles and in the lectures of some Ukrainian historians and literary men there are ideological mistakes and perversions, and efforts to revive the bourgeois nationalist conceptions of the historian Hrushevsky and his 'school.' "

● [814] 538 626 The weight of the attack fell upon the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR for two books which it had published. One was the first volume of a *History of Ukraine* which had appeared in 1943 and the other was *An Outline of the History of Ukrainian Literature* which had appeared in 1945. The authors of both books were accused of having failed to periodicize Ukrainian history and literature according to the Marxo-Leninist tradition and of having followed Hrushevsky and Yefremiv in being deceived by external political events. They were charged with remarks that could be interpreted as maintaining an early separation of Ukrainian culture from Russian, when it was a fact that the three brotherly nations, the Great Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians, had had a joint culture until the fourteenth century, after which the Great Russians became the truest heirs and interpreters of the whole. They were charged with idealizing the old bourgeois nationalists as V. Naumenko and O. Levytsky, of admiring the old state of patriarchal private property and of failing to realize the great ideological gulf between Shevchenko, who stood in the tradition of Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, etc., and Kulish who was a liberal and not a revolutionist. They were condemned for having a good word for such nationalist counter-revolutionists as Vynnychenko and Oles and for calling a competent poet, I. Steshchenko, who had been a minister under Petlyura. They forced their own flatterer, Rylsky, to leave his post as head of the Union of Soviet Writers of the Ukraine for not having taken a sufficiently firm stand in condemning the mistakes of the other writers, and for a while he was in disfavor.

The accusations penned in Moscow and printed in *Pravda* and the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* were reprinted in the Ukrainian papers with even more vulgarity and abuse. They poured out their venom at nearly all the writers and historians who regarded the use of the Ukrainian language as expressing the feelings and the

The Soviet Cultural Policy in the Ukraine After the War

The situation is even more severe in the field of language. 191
Korniychuk after World War II emphasized that Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism was not to be sought only by a consideration of the contents of books and paintings. It was reflected in a still more dangerous form in the language of the books themselves. Any author who showed a predilection for the use of the older forms of the language or sought to develop it in any way other than the Communist Party desired was thereby convicting himself of holding nationalistic sentiments and of being dangerously reactionary. He thus accused of bourgeois nationalism even those writers as Yanovsky who had been most rigorous in following the party line in content. 626 538

The real significance of this statement of Korniychuk's is shown by the *Ukrainian-Russian Dictionary* which finally appeared in 1948 under the editorship of L. A. Bulakhovsky and M. F. Rylsky. The work was published in Moscow, although it bore the stamp of the Institute of Language Study of the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR. 191 626 814

In this the authors made no concealment of their program, for they definitely stated that their work was based upon the "spoken" Ukrainian of the government offices (where it was the most corrupted by Russian words), and not the older Ukrainian language as spoken before the introduction of the Bolshevik reforms. They added, too, that they had supplied from Russian whatever was lacking in Ukrainian, for "thanks to the Russian language, the Ukrainian has been able to acquire the capacity to respond to the needs of socialist construction and to satisfy the cultural needs of the Ukrainian people." [198]

Stripped of its Communist jargon, this passage merely means that the Moscow authorities have decided to carry on their policy of russification in a new way. They have recognized the gap between the older Ukrainian language and the hodgepodge which they have produced and they are now insisting on using the words of the older usage in their most narrow and restricted sense, and by refusing to recognize any possibility of development in Ukrainian or any changes in it, they are forcing Ukrainian to become a dead language and by an inverted purism are planning to compel

191 the Ukrainians to recognize that Russian and Russian alone is in
626 a position to grow and develop.

●814 This is entirely in line with the new philological policy dictated by Stalin after his repudiation of the late Prof. Marr and what was commonly known as Marrism, a theory that Stalin had sponsored for many years. Now he was willing to argue that Russian as the language of the USSR was not only the Russian language as the language of the Russian people but it was also in a new sense a zonal language, the approved language of Socialism and Communism and, as such, it had already absorbed all that it needed and its mission was to replace all those languages which were spoken by people who had awaked to the truth of the Moscow doctrines.

626 Thus the new theories of language study that were officially
814 accepted in Moscow opened new vistas for cultural oppression and perversion of the Ukrainian masses. They were a signal for renewed efforts, not only to control the Ukrainian cultural life in the present and the future but their efforts were extended to the past and the scholars were set to carry out an artificial restatement of Ukrainian history, literature and culture from the earliest known periods.

538 It is small wonder then that the modern post-war Ukrainian
626 literature is becoming more and more a pallid and bloodless imitation of the stereotyped patterns required for Great Russian and that even those authors who have sold themselves to the Stalinist regime are unable to produce anything of real value or of even mediocre excellence. They are turning out the average propaganda material against the imperialistic Americans on the lines ordered by the Politiburo with never a thought except the income and perquisites which they are slated to receive and the constant terror lest at some moment by an unfortunate slip they may be accused justly or unjustly of that terrible crime of bourgeois nationalism and lose in an instant all that they have worked for years to win.

The cultural pressure exerted on eastern Ukraine is spread likewise with even more force over those portions in the West which had been formerly under Poland or Czechoslovakia. Here, as former parts of the old Hapsburg monarchy, the writers had had

to leave Ukraine and to serve the Muscovite State. The Ukrainian, Prince Alexander Bezborodko, directed for many years Russian foreign policy in the time of Catherine II. (1762—1796) and of Paul I., who is known, however, to have disliked Russia and to have dreamt of a free Ukraine. The greatest talents of modern Russian literature, Gogol and Dostoyevsky, were of Ukrainian origin; Gogol did not master Russian exactly until the end of his life, it was strange to him. Far-famed scholars — Maxim Kovalevsky, sociologist; the philosophers Lesevich and Yurkevich, Vladimir Vernadsky, geologist, the famous painter Ilya Repin, — were Ukrainians of whom Russian culture is proud.

The Ukrainians in the provinces of Austria, Galicia and Bukovina had lost their educated classes under the rule of the Poles and Turks. Here, as well as in the Ukrainian territory to the West of the Carpathian Mountains, Carpatho-Ukraine, which was under Hungarian rule, the Ukrainians were principally peasants; the cities were mostly not-Ukrainian. During the 'Spring of the Peoples' in 1848 the Ukrainian national movement in Austria and Hungary also appeared. In Galicia the Ruthenian Supreme Council — a political representative of the Ukrainians in Austria — was created. At the elections for the Austrian Parliament the Ukrainians secured a considerable number of mandates. The national rebirth began also in the Ukrainian territory on the western side of the Carpathian Mountains. But the reaction which occured in Austria hindered the Ukrainian national development. The Vienna Government put the Ukrainians in Galicia and Carpatho-Ukraine under Polish and Hungarian rule respectively in order to make the Poles and Hungarians loyal towards Austria. This enabled the Poles and Hungarians to conduct a policy of denationalisation against the Ukrainians. Only at the end of the 19th century, in spite of great hindrances on the part of the Poles, a Ukrainian political and cultural life developed in Galicia. In connection with this, Ukrainian science and literature, prohibited in Kiev, Kharkov, and Odessa, found a home in Galicia (Lviw), and Bukovina (Chernivtsi). Ukrainians from Tsarist Ukraine published here their periodicals and books; here, under the direction of the famous Kievan historian Michael Hrushevsky, the Ukrainian Shevchenko Scientific Society developed. It was by its energy a real Ukrainian Academy of Science.

Gradually the Ukrainians in Austria were overcoming the obstacles created by the ruling class of the Polish nobility, and secured new mandates in the Austrian Parliament and the Galician Diet.

871 every teacher in the schools in Ukraine had orders to spread Com-
650 munist propaganda, to fight the appearance of national discontent with the Russian rule by every means, and was obliged to insult the
● [814] struggle of the Ukrainian people for liberation. In schools, Ukrainian history was falsely interpreted as well as in literature and in films. For instance, clinging to the tradition taken from Tsarist Russia, the Hetman of Ukraine Ivan Mazeppa who at the beginning of the 18th century wanted to free Ukraine from Muscovite dependence, has in Soviet historiography the epithet of a 'traitor' and 'reactionary'. But Tsar Peter I. and Tsar Ivan the Terrible, are glorified by Soviet school and science as 'progressive democratic rulers'.

659 The Ukrainian religious life under the régime of Soviet Russian
661 occupation had to suffer from special persecutions. In 1921, in Soviet Ukraine the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Autocephal Church, independent of the Moscow Patriarch, was organised. This Church, headed by its idealistic leaders, the Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky, Volodymyr Chekhivsky, former Premier of the Government of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic in 1918—19 and others, completed a great task for the cultural and moral improvement of the Ukrainian nation. Moscow attempted to destroy the strong organisation of the Ukrainian Autocephal Church with the help of its agents, but did not succeed in this. Then the Soviet Government ruined by bloody repressions the Ukrainian Church after having destroyed its entire hierarchy and masses of its followers (1929).

661 In connection with the 'General Line' which had placed unbear-
517 able burdens on Ukrainian economy, a mass discontent against Moscow increased among the Ukrainians. The ruthless economic
815 exploitation and political oppression by Russia caused, among the Ukrainian people, a permanent oppositon which appeared in various forms. Therefore, the Moscow Government decided to terrorise the Ukrainian intelligentsia which bore the brunt of the political efforts of the Ukrainian nation. For this purpose a number of trials against the most prominent representatives of Ukrainian science and social life were arranged; the case of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine with the participation of the prominent member of the Ukrainian Academy of Science, Serhy Yefremov, Volodymyr Chekhivsky, former Premier, Professor Osyp Hermayze and others in Kharkov, in spring 1930. Thousands of innocent people, especially students, perished in the prisoners' cells of the GPU without any trial. Simultaneously, the Ukrainian Academy of Science was exposed to repressions. In place of the imprisoned or expelled members of the Ukrainian Academy of Science, the Communists
appointed their own people though without scientific merits,
46 but politically faithful to Moscow.

15: Pap S-4, 5 (no date) 1952 RD1 Ukraine RD1

661 by the Soviet regime and, as a result, made them collectively responsible for the delayed defeat of the German Army. This condemnation brought about the liquidation of several Soviet nationalities such as the Chechen-Ingush, the Kalmyks, the Crimean Tartars and the Germans of the Volga.[51] With regard to the larger nationalities, like the Ukrainians, the Byelo-Russians, the Caucasians, who also proved to be unreliable during the crisis of 1941-43, Stalin had chosen the policy of total Russification, beginning with wholesale purges and persecutions, especially among the intelligentsia.[52]

661 The decision, however, of the Soviet Government to return to the old policy of Russification was met by strong opposition. Ukrainian history, for example, was based (up to 1934 and again during the Second World War) on Hrushevskyj's works. It was, therefore, inconvenient even for the Russian Bolsheviks who were assured of Stalin's support to suddenly reject this interpretation of history since it had previous official approval by the Communists. Facing this situation, Soviet Russian historians were compelled to invent evidence that Hrushevskyj was not a scientist-historian, but a "bourgeois nationalist" who deliberately falsified actual facts in order to prove the differences between the Russian and Ukrainian nations.

One of the striking illustrations of Soviet-Russian difficulties in dealing with Ukrainian history and literature was offered by Litvin in *Bolshevik* (official Party periodical, in an article entitled, "About the History of the Ukrainian People"). In this article, Litvin admitted that the presentation of Ukrainian history and literature had up to this time been based on serious errors and deviations from the Soviet principle. These errors were promoted by the "enemies of the people" who had not yet been liquidated by the Party. He uncovered these deviations and errors in practically all the Soviet-Ukrainian histories used in schools and universities over a period of twenty-five years, and accused most of the Soviet-Ukrainian historians of having

51 P. E. Mosely, "Soviet Policy and Nationality Conflicts in East Central Europe," *The Soviet Union, a Symposium*, W. Gurian, ed. (Notre Dame, 1951), p. 68.

52 Stalin's decision to return to the Tsarist policy of Russification should be considered as a severe blow to all non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, especially if one recalls his statement of what such promotion of Russian chauvinism would mean: "Every attempt to deviate toward great Russian chauvinism is an endeavor to ignore national differences of language, culture and mode of life; an endeavor to prepare the way for the liquidation of the national republics and regions; an endeavor to undermine the principle of national equality." Stalin's report at the XVI. Sjezd Wsesojuznoi Communisticheskoji Partiyi (B), (June 26-July 13, 1930) cf. *Sotchinenija*, Vol. XII (Moscow, 1949), p. 362.

15: Pap S-4, 5 (no date) 1952 RD1 Ukraine RD1

served the anti-Soviet cause. The most inexcusable "crime" of these Soviet-Ukrainian writers was their failure to show that Great Russian literature played a significant role in developing Ukrainian culture. Litvin declared:

> The uncovery of serious shortcomings and mistakes in various publications of the Academy of Science of Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic by the Central Committees of All-Union Communist Party and the Communist Party of the Ukraine, as well as in many publications of the other Ukrainian publishing houses proved that the known group of historians and litterateurs in Ukraine are not sufficiently armed with the Marxist-Leninist materialistic methods and remain in the prison of bourgeois nationalistic methodology of Hrushevskyj. . . . Bourgeois historian Hrushevskyj developed a fallacious anti-historical conception of the origin and development of the Ukrainian people, as if the Ukrainian people had no relationship with the Russian people, as if the entire historical development of both nations had not proceeded in a genuine friendship, unity and mutual influence, but in a constant antagonism.[53]

In order to discourage Soviet historians from referring in the future to the works of Hrushevskyj, Litvin emphasized that Hrushevskyj had been in constant touch with the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries, which directed anti-Soviet uprisings in the territories of the Soviet Ukraine long after the establishment of the Soviet order. Finally, after giving advice on how to write an "acceptable" history of the Ukraine, Litvin concluded that the "Ukrainian" people must wait for scientific works from Soviet historians, who will be able to present concrete proof of the "brotherly" union between the Russian and Ukrainian people and their common loyalty to the Bolsheviks.

Simultaneously with Litvin's accusations, the co-workers of Soviet-Ukrainian journals, newspapers and propaganda were advised to adjust themselves to the new Party line by denouncing and purging the "remnants" of the Ukrainian National elements from Soviet-Ukrainian literature. They were further advised to praise the Soviet order as an achievement of the Great Russian people, who, therefore, must be recognized as the leaders of all nations on the road to Communism.

The climax of the anti-Ukrainian and pro-Russian course was

---

53 Litvin, "About the History of the Ukrainian People," *Bolshevik*, No. 7 (Moscow, 1947), pp. 44-45.

orientation. Khvylovy considered that Ukrainian literature should go its own way and look towards Western Europe, no matter whether bourgeois or proletarian. Shumsky advocated that the Ukrainian Communist Party should be independent of the Russian Communist Party. 665 186

This crisis within the Ukrainian Communist Party prompted the Moscow Bolshevik leadership in 1926 to make one of Stalin's principal assistants, L. M. Kaganovich, Ukrainian party secretary for a short period during which the first great purge against the nationalist deviation was carried out. Khvylovy was ejected from the party and Shumsky expelled from the territory of the Ukrainian S.S.R. When Khvylovy repented he was given another chance and re-admitted as a party member, but in 1933 he committed suicide after a new campaign against Ukrainian nationalism had been launched. 661 665 186

Admittedly the methods of repression in the Ukraine were comparatively liberal until 1929-30. From that time onwards the oppressive policy of the Soviet State overshadowed in the minds of the Ukrainian nationalists in the U.S.S.R. the contribution which Polish, Rumanian and Czech communists were ready to make for the establishment of a Greater Soviet Ukraine. Many Ukrainian nationalists became convinced that national unity was less vital to the Ukrainians than cultural and political freedom, in particular that free intercourse with the West which Moscow was unwilling to grant. [177]

The Soviet State inflicted many heavy blows on the representatives of the western orientation among the Ukrainians, but never vanquished it entirely. In this struggle Ukrainian nationalism commanded an almost inexhaustible reservoir of resistance forces. Bloodshed and terror seemed incapable of stamping out the longing for spiritual freedom. Almost every year brought the discovery of a new conspiracy, a new series of trials, a new trend in national Ukrainian deviations. In 1929 the G.P.U. discovered the 'Spilka Vyzvolenia Ukrainy', the 'Union for the Liberation of the Ukraine', in 1931 the 'Ukrainian National Centre', in 1933 the 'Ukrainian Military Organization' (UVO). 668 661

The offensive by the central Government against the Ukraine's trends towards a more independent existence was conducted not only in the political sphere but also in the field of culture, where the régime had originally granted some scope to Ukrainian nationalism. One of the main bulwarks of Ukrainian nationalism was the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The history section of the Academy had turned out to be so anti-Bolshevik that it had to be disbanded altogether while its head, Professor Hrushevsky, was exiled to Russia proper. This banishment of the 'great old man' of Ukrainian nationalism from his place of work showed better than anything else that the policy of reconciliation which Moscow had originally pursued in its relation towards Ukrainian nationalism had been but a short-term manœuvre. [814]

*[Cf. category 665, p. 130 --Analyst]

21: Kolarz J-4 (no date) 1952 R1 Soviet Union
UKRAINE RD1

themselves so long without assistance from a part of the Soviet Ukrainian peasantry. 000

While the armed struggle of Ukrainian nationalists was confined to a small fringe along the Ukrainian border, the Soviet Government had to face more subtle forms of opposition throughout the Soviet Ukraine. One of the outstanding features of the post-war development in the Ukraine was that the same cultural institutions which in the purges of the thirties had been compelled to change their nationalistic Ukrainian personnel from top to bottom, were again involved in difficulties with the Soviet authorities. 186 814 661

This was particularly true of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and especially of its Institute for Language and Literature and its Institute for History. The former produced in 1945 an *Essay on the History of Ukrainian Literature*, whose authors stressed the dependence of Ukrainian literature on the West and 'concealed that Russian and Ukrainian literatures exercised a mutual fertilizing influence on each other in the course of centuries'.[19]

Even more serious 'nationalist excesses' were committed in the field of history writing. It seems that practically all major historical works which the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences published in 1941–5 contained 'serious mistakes of a nationalistic character'. For several years the party and state authorities did not pay much attention to the works of Ukrainian academicians; but after 1946–7 the leading party organs restarted to analyse Ukrainian historical writings and pointed out that Ukrainian historians had never, in fact, succeeded in overcoming the influence of the nationalistic-bourgeois school of Professor Hrushevsky.[20]

In the light of official Soviet admissions the ideological consolidation of the Ukraine seemed not to have advanced by a single inch since the days when Hrushevsky was still the teacher of the historians and Khvylovy the authority for those dealing with problems of Ukrainian literature. Twenty years after Khvylovy's first expulsion from the Communist Party, and fifteen years after his suicide, orthodox Ukrainian Bolsheviks were still haunted by the fear of 'Khvylovy-ist ideas' and were active in opposing them.

The first step in the purge of Ukrainian literature in the post-war period was the replacement of the editorial boards of the three leading Ukrainian literary journals *Vitchizna* (Fatherland), *Dnipro* (Dnieper) and *Radyansky Lviv* (Soviet Lvov). All three journals had been accused of systematically printing nationalist novels and articles. As the Ukrainian Union of Soviet Writers was obviously responsible for ideological offences committed in literary journals published on Ukrainian territory, the purge had to be extended to this organization as well. The leading personalities of the writers' union, including its president, 186 661 538

[Cf. cat. 116, pp. 30-31, R1 Sov. Union; 21: Kolarz -- Analyst]